

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 31 December 2003 with eighteen claims, three of which were written in independent form. Claims 15-18 have been allowed.

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue noted by the Examiner.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,296,988 to Lee ("Lee").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "photochemically removing the pattern resist that remains after the cleaning and ashing steps." The applicant respectfully submits the prior art of record does not appear to show, teach, or suggest this limitation in combination with the other limitations recited by Claim 1.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0053505A1 to Chinn *et al.* ("Chinn"). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,472,315 to Nguyen *et al.* ("Nguyen").

Claims 3-7 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claim, much less the limitations of the independent claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite, "photochemically removing the pattern resist that remains after the cleaning and ashing steps." The applicant respectfully submits the prior art of record does not appear to show, teach, or suggest this limitation in combination with the other limitations recited by Claim 8.

Claims 11, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by


Lee. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Chinn. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Nguyen.

Claims 9-14 depend from Claim 8 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 8, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claim, much less the limitations of the independent claim in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

The applicant notes that no reason for the rejection of Claim 2 was given in the official action. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on its merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claim, much less the limitations of the independent claim in combination with the additional limitations of dependent Claim 2.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418